

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-20, and 22-25 are pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-20, and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316 to De Boor et al. (“De Boor”), Nokia 6160 Owner’s Manual (“Nokia”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20010041590 to Silberfenig et al. (“Silberfenig”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,516,202 to Hawkins et al. (“Hawkins”).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10 and 17 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “the computing device includes a note button associated with an address entry for inputting notes associated with said address entry.” Claim 10 has been amended to recite that the computing device includes a “a note button associated with an address entry for inputting notes associated with said address entry.” Claim 17 has been amended to recite “the computing device includes a note button associated with an address entry for inputting notes associated with said address entry.”

As mentioned in the background, integrating mobile phone functions within a PDA has many advantages. Palm sized portability is combined with the higher resolution displays and robust operating system functions of a PDA to ensure more convenient functionality for the consumer. Among the problems the present invention is intended to solve is the problem of combining phone functionality into a PDA form factor. Part of the problem of integrating phone and PDA functionality is the potential for PDA functions to interfere with phone functions. Therefore, the present invention proposes that the computer device suspend any non-phone functions in response to a user selecting the call initiation button. Additionally, by taking advantage of the combination of PDA functionality and phone form factor, the user may take

notes based on each associated address entry contained within the address application of the computing device.

The Examiner's base reference, De Boor, is directed to a man-machine interface assembled from a mark-up language. Particularly, De Boor is directed to integrating world wide web (HTML mark-up language) with telephony functions in a computing device. The telephony functions are assumed to exist already in the computing device so that world web capability can be appended to the telephony function. Therefore, De Boor does not disclose or teach that the computer device suspend any non-phone functions in response to a user selecting the call initiation button.

The shortcomings of De Boor are not overcome by Nokia, Silberfenig, or Hawkins nor are Nokia, Silberfenig, or Hawkins cited for such teachings. Nokia is directed to a manual for a mobile phone without personal digital assistant functions. Silberfenig is directed to a combination cellular phone and email device. Silberfenig does not teach or suggest a personal digital assistant such as a computing device directed to information management. Hawkins is directed to an external cellular communication expansion for a mobile computer system. Therefore, neither Nokia nor Silberfenig teach or suggest that the user may take notes based on each associated address entry contained within the address application of the computing device.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Hawkins, Nokia and Silberfenig does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 17 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-16, 18-20 and 22-25, by their dependency on claims 1, 10 and 17 respectively, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Application No.:
Amendment Dated:
Reply to Final Office Action of:

09/675,406
March 5, 2007
January 3, 2007

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner enter the Amendment after Final and reconsider all presently outstanding rejections. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: March 5, 2007

By: _____
Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860